



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,037	07/10/2003	Hong-Seok Lee	277/ 011	9800
27849	7590	05/06/2008		
LEE & MORSE, P.C. 3141 FAIRVIEW PARK DRIVE SUITE 500 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22042			EXAMINER BODDIE, WILLIAM	
			ART UNIT 2629	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/06/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/616,037

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

WILLIAM L. BODDIE

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-8 and 10-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-8 and 10-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI-108)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. In an amendment dated, February 29th, 2008, the Applicants traversed claims 1, 3-8 and 10-20. Currently claims 1, 3-8 and 10-20 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed February 29th, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. On pages 6-8 of the Remarks, the Applicants argue that Nally and Sato teach away from "putting a black period after a white period." The Applicants argue that Nally uses the white period to counter the effects of the black period. Similarly the Applicants argue that Sato also discloses a white period following a black period to reduce the time required for the liquid crystal to respond.

The Examiner does not deny that these are embodiments put forth by Nally and Sato. It is important to note, however, that all, save one, of the periods are chosen for the voltage applied to the liquid crystal. The black period of Nally is the only which is specifically chosen because it results in the black color, thereby increasing display quality. The white period of Nally, and both periods of Sato are chosen for their voltage effects to the liquid crystal. The increased response which Sato desires by applying a white period is not because the period is white. It is due to the voltage that is applied. This is clearly stated by Sato where it is stated that, "the 2nd non-video signal **voltage** serves to reduce the response period of the liquid crystal." (col. 17, lines 34-37)

4. On pages 8-9 of the Remarks, the Applicants argue that combining Nally with Sato would destroy the Nally reference. Specifically the Applicants seem to feel that

replacing Nally's normally black display with a normally white display would not allow desired colors to be displayed.

The Examiner must respectfully disagree. It is seen as well-known and certainly within the skills of one of ordinary skill of the art to perform the necessary modifications to a driving waveform to achieve correct color display when switching from a normally black to a normally white display. However, the fixed data portion of the driving waveform was chosen by Nally specifically for its voltage effects on the display and as such should and would not be also altered.

5. On page 9 of the Remarks, the Applicants argue that the combination would require a substantial reconstruction and redesign of the Nally invention.

The Examiner must respectfully disagree. As disclosed above it is well-known and certainly with the skills of one of ordinary skill in the art to perform the necessary modifications to a driving waveform to achieve correct color display when switching from a normally black to a normally white display. Furthermore, Sato proposes multiple embodiments which include both normally black displays and normally white displays. Therefore, the prior art has specifically discussed the viability of both of the display types with little reconstruction and redesign. To say that simply changing the display type would change the basic principles of liquid crystal display driving waveforms is exaggeration.

6. On pages 10-11 of the Remarks, the Applicants argue that Sato leads away from the claimed subject matter, by discussing a field sequential color display.

The Examiner recognizes that field sequential color display is discussed in Sato. However, Sato also discusses an alternate embodiment which uses color filters and subframes in column 42, lines 26-39. As such Sato can be seen teaching both methods of color display and certainly does not teach away or lead away from the claimed invention.

7. On pages 11-12 of the Remarks, the Applicants reiterate their above arguments for the dependent claims.

As shown above the rejections of the claims are seen as sufficient, correct and reasonable interpretations of the cited prior art. The rejections are thus maintained in the current office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 8, 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nally et al. (US 2004/0217932) in view of Sato et al. (US 7,030,848).

With respect to claim 1, Nally discloses, a normally black (note the voltage waveforms in fig. 7) liquid crystal display (LCD) (fig. 33), comprising:

an LCD panel having a plurality of color filters to selectively filter white light (fig. 1; paras. 6 and 11); and

a driver for driving the LCD panel (source and gate driver in fig. 33), wherein a frame of an image being driven by the driver includes:

a display period during which the driver drives the LCD panel to display a desired color by mixing a combination of light output by the plurality of color filters (para. 6), and

a first non-display period (fixed data in fig. 7) including a white light display (white in fig. 7) period and a first no-light display period (black in fig. 7) during which the driver drives the LCD panel to display white light (white in fig. 7) during the white light display period then no light (black in fig. 7) during the first no-light display period at a different and distinct time period than the white light display period of the first non-display period (para. 27, discusses the operation and advantages of this driving scheme; also note para. 14 which expressly states that such a driving scheme is applicable to color filter TFT display systems).

Nally does not expressly disclose, that the first no-light display period occurs after the white light display period, or a second non-display period.

Sato discloses a LCD comprising a first non-display period ($T_a - T_b$ in fig. 11d) and a second non-display period ($T_{c1} - T_{c2}$ in fig. 11d) including a second no-light display period ($T_{c1} - T_{c2}$ in fig. 11d) during which the driver drives the LCD panel to display no light (clear from fig. 11d that no light is displayed during the period; also note col. 17, lines 17-33).

Sato also discloses, that normally white display is preferred over normally black displays (col. 17, lines 28-33).

Nally and Sato are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor namely, LCD display control schemes.

At the time of the invention it would have obvious to replace the normally black display of Nally with the normally white display of Sato, as well as to include the second no-light display period of Sato in the display of Nally.

The motivation for using normally white liquid crystal being the well known benefit of higher color purity and brightness. Motivation for adding the additional no-light display period being to reduce the response period of the liquid crystal and thereby increase display quality (Sato; col. 17, lines 34-37).

It should be clear that upon the changing to normally-white, the low voltage applied to the LCD of Nally will generate a white display and the high burst afterwards results in a black period. As such Nally, as modified by Sato, discloses that the no-light period occurs after the white light display period.

With respect to claim 8, Nally discloses, a method for driving a liquid crystal display (LCD) including an LCD panel (fig. 33) having a plurality of color filters to selectively filter white light (fig. 1, paras. 6 and 11), the method comprising:

during a frame of an image to be displayed (clear from fig. 7, for example):

driving the LCD panel during a display period (color in fig 7) to display a desired color by mixing a combination of light output from the plurality of color filters (para. 6);
and

driving the LCD panel during a first non-display period including a first no-light display period (black in fig. 7) and a white light display period (white in fig. 7) to display

Art Unit: 2629

white light during the white light display period and no light during the first no-light display period (para. 27).

Nally does not expressly disclose, that the first no-light display period occurs after the white light display period, or a second non-display period.

Sato discloses a LCD comprising a first non-display period ($T_a - T_b$ in fig. 11d) and a second non-display period ($T_{c1} - T_{c2}$ in fig. 11d) including a second no-light display period ($T_{c1} - T_{c2}$ in fig. 11d) during which the driver drives the LCD panel to display no light (clear from fig. 11d that no light is displayed during the period; also note col. 17, lines 17-33).

Sato also discloses, that normally white display is preferred over normally black displays (col. 17, lines 28-33).

Nally and Sato are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor namely, LCD display control schemes.

At the time of the invention it would have obvious to replace the normally black display of Nally with the normally white display of Sato, as well as to include the second no-light display period of Sato in the display of Nally.

The motivation for using normally white liquid crystal being the well known benefit of higher color purity and brightness. Motivation for adding the additional no-light display period being to reduce the response period of the liquid crystal and thereby increase display quality (Sato; col. 17, lines 34-37).

It should be clear that upon the changing to normally-white, the low voltage applied to the LCD of Nally will generate a white display and the high burst afterwards

results in a black period. As such Nally, as modified by Sato, discloses that the no-light period occurs after the white light display period.

With respect to claims 12-13, Nally and Sato disclose, the LCD according to claims 1 and 8 (see above).

Nally further discloses, wherein the LCD panel is driven to display no light during each non-display period between each of the display periods during which the desired color formed by mixing a combination of light output by the plurality of color filters is displayed (seems clear from fig. 7, that the black period is inserted prior to each color display).

With respect to claim 14, Nally and Sato disclose, the LCD as claimed in claim 1 (see above).

Nally, as modified by Sato, further discloses, wherein during the first non-display period, the driver drives the LCD panel to display no light immediately after driving the LCD panel to display white light (with the switch to a normally white display, Nally would still achieve all the benefits of the invention, the only difference being that the white period would occur prior to the black period).

With respect to claim 15, Nally and Sato disclose, the LCD as claimed in claim 14 (see above).

Nally further discloses, wherein the display period of the frame follows the first non-display period of the frame (clear from fig. 7).

With respect to claim 16, Nally and Sato disclose, the LCD as claimed in claim 15 (see above).

Nally, when combined with Sato, further discloses, wherein the display period occurs between the first no-light display period and the second no-light display period (clear from fig. 11d of Sato; as well as fig. 7 of Nally).

To further explain, Nally's original waveform is black|white|color|hold|repeat. Sato's normally white display and second non-display period is black|color|black|repeat. Upon combination the Nally waveform becomes, white|black|color|black|repeat.

With respect to claim 17, Nally and Sato disclose, the method as claimed in claim 8 (see above).

Nally, as modified by Sato, further discloses, wherein during the first non-display period, the driver drives the LCD panel to display no light immediately after driving the LCD panel to display white light (with the switch to a normally white display, Nally would still achieve all the benefits of the invention, the only difference being that the white period would occur prior to the black period).

With respect to claim 18, Nally and Sato disclose, the method as claimed in claim 8 (see above).

Nally further discloses, wherein the display period of the frame follows the first non-display period of the frame (clear from fig. 7).

With respect to claim 19, Nally and Sato disclose, the method as claimed in claim 8 (see above).

Nally, when combined with Sato, further discloses, driving the LCD panel so as to drive the display period between the first no-light display period and the second no-light display period (clear from fig. 11d of Sato; as well as fig. 7 of Nally).

To further explain, Nally's original waveform is black|white|color|hold|repeat. Sato's normally white display and second non-display period is black|color|black|repeat. Upon combination the Nally waveform becomes, white|black|color|black|repeat.

With respect to claim 20, Nally and Sato disclose, the method as claimed in claim 19 (see above).

Nally, modified by Sato, further discloses, wherein the LCD panel is driven such that a white light display period of a subsequent frame occurs after the second no-light display period of the previous frame and before a no-light period of the subsequent frame (upon the inclusion of the black adjustment data, the waveform would appear, [[white|black|color|black]] [[white|black|color|black]]).

10. Claims 3-5, 7, and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nally et al. (US 2004/0217932) in view of Sato et al. (US 7,030,848) and further in view of Iwauchi (US 5,843,492).

With respect to claim 3, Nally and Sato disclose, the LCD according to claim 1 (see above).

Neither Sato nor Nally expressly disclose, wherein the plurality of color filters are transmissive color filters attached to an upper portion of the LCD panel.

Iwauchi discloses, a plurality of transmissive color filters (6 in fig. 1) attached to an upper portion of the LCD panel (8 in fig. 1, also note col. 13, lines 63-67 and col. 14, lines 1-12).

Sato, Nally and Iwauchi are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor namely, filter TFT LCD panels.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to construct the filters of Nally and Sato as shown by Iwauchi's upper portion transmissive color filters.

The motivation for doing so would have been to achieve a brighter multi-color display (Iwauchi; col. 3, lines 65-67).

With respect to claim 4, Nally, Sato and Iwauchi disclose, the LCD according to claim 3 (see above).

Neither Nally nor Sato expressly disclose, a reflecting plate.

Iwauchi further discloses, a reflecting plate (16 in fig. 2a, col. 7, lines 15-17).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a reflecting plate, taught by Iwauchi, in the LCD panel disclosed by Nally and Sato.

The motivation for doing so would have been to lower power consumption by removing the need for a backlight to illuminate the panel.

With respect to claim 5, Nally and Sato disclose, the LCD according to claim 1 (see above).

Neither Sato nor Nally expressly disclose, wherein the color filters are reflective and attached to the lower portion of the LCD panel.

Iwauchi discloses, reflective color filters attached to the lower portion of the LCD panel (21(a,b,c) in fig. 6, col. 14, lines 25-28)

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include reflective color filters as disclosed by Iwauchi, in the LCD panel of Nally and Sato.

The motivation for doing so would have been to remove the need for a reflecting plate in panel.

With respect to claim 7, Nally, Sato and Iwauchi disclose, the LCD according to claim 5 (see above).

Iwauchi further discloses, wherein the plurality of color filters of the reflective color filter are made of dielectrics having different indices of refraction (While Iwauchi's embodiments use cyan, magenta, and yellow there is no reason one couldn't create the same filter using red, green, and blue. Col. 14, lines 36-45).

With respect to claim 10, as claim 10 is merely a method statement of the above limitations of claim 3, claim 10 is rejected on the same merits as shown above.

With respect to claim 11, as claim 11 is merely a method statement of the above limitations of claim 5, claim 11 is rejected on the same merits as shown above.

11. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nally et al. (US 2004/0217932) in view of Sato et al. (US 7,030,848) in view of Iwauchi (US 5,841,492) and further in view of Alvarez (US 5,131,736).

With respect to claim 6, Nally, Sato and Iwauchi disclose, the LCD according to claim 5 (see above).

Neither Nally, Sato nor Iwauchi expressly disclose wherein the plurality of color filters are made of photonic crystals, which are alternate arrays of dielectrics.

Alvarez discloses, a filter constructed of alternate arrays of dielectrics (col. 3, lines 27-45).

Nally, Sato, Iwauchi, and Alvarez are all analogous art because they are directed to a similar problem solving area, namely filtering white light efficiently.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the dielectric array of Alvarez in place of the dielectric mirror of Iwauchi, Sato and Nally.

The motivation for doing so would have been for the higher efficiency of the dielectric array (Alvarez, col. 1, lines 21-25).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILLIAM L. BODDIE whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 2629

(571)272-0666. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:30 - 4:30 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz can be reached on (571) 272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Sumati Lefkowitz/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/W. L. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 2629
4/17/08